

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,926	06/27/2003	Ian Stuart Robinson	NG(ST)-6402	7014
26294	7590 07/2	005	EXAMINER	
•	SUNDHEIM, CO	FILE, E	FILE, ERIN M	
	526 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 1111 CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114			PAPER NUMBER
·		2634		

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

lpha				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/608,926	ROBINSON ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
The MAILING DATE of the	Erin M. File	2634		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 Ju</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4)	vn from consideration. is/are rejected. objected to.			
	· -			
<ul> <li>9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex </li> </ul>	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/27/2003.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 10/608,926

Art Unit: 2634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6, 20-23, 27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hori et al. in further view of Eckstein et al.

Claims 1, 21, 23, 27, Hori discloses a digital-to-analog converter including a deltasigma modulator (abstract). Although Hori discloses a frequency source selecting either
a first or second signal in accordance with the delta-sigma modulator (abstract), Hori
fails to disclose a frequency source that provides a selected one of a plurality of
frequency patterns based on a frequency selection input. However, Eckstein discloses
a digitally controlled frequency synthesizer where a controller accepts a group address
signal from a group address selector for determining the specific frequency pattern to be
employed (col. 5, lines 12-15). Because Hori discloses frequency source selection
between two sources, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of
invention to incorporate Eckstein's frequency pattern selection into Hori's apparatus.

Claims 2, 4, 20, 30, contain the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. Further, as Eckstein discloses the use of an address signal for determining the frequency pattern, it can be reasonably assumed said frequency patterns are stored in memory.

Claim 3, 22, inherit the limitations of Claims 2, 21 respectively, although neither Hori nor Eckstein disclose the plurality of frequency patterns further comprising delta-sigma modulated patterns associated with the frequencies represented by the plurality of frequency patterns. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to perform the modulation on the stored frequency patterns, since applicant has not disclosed that storing the modulated patterns solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well storing frequency patterns and then modulating said patterns instead of storing the delta-sigma modulated frequency patterns.

Claim 6, inherits the limitations of Claim 1. The further limitation of comprising a delta-sigma modulator to provide the delta-sigma modulated signal to the digital-to-analog converter based on associated processing of the selected one of the frequency patterns is met by Hori as the device as disclosed by Hori is a digital to analog converter using a delta sigma modulated signal (abstract).

Art Unit: 2634

Claim 29, inherits the limitations of Claim 27. Further, Hori discloses a low pass filter (fig. 14, 500) to filter the analog signal (col. 2, lines 41-45).

3. Claims 9-11, 14-17, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hori et al. and Eckstein et al. and in further view of Hickling.

Claims 9, 14, 21, contain the limitations of Claim 1, further, although neither Hori et al. nor Eckstein disclose providing the analog signal as a frequency hopping signal that hops between selected ones of the plurality of frequency patterns at a hop rate based on the selection input, Kickling discloses a delta sigma modulator with a digital to analog converter (fig. 4) which he discloses is applicable for use in frequency hopping modulation techniques (col. 1, lines 19-23). Because of the similarity of Kickling's delta sigma modulation to the delta sigma modulator used by Hori, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Kickling's delta sigma modulator into Hori's apparatus.

Claims 10, 24, inherit the limitations of Claims 9 and 21 respectively, the limitation of a a filter coupled to mitigate noise in the analog signal provided by the digital-to-analog converter is met by Hori as described in Claim 29 above.

Claims 11, 15 inherit the limitations of Claims 1 and 14. Further, Kickling discloses a one-bit digital-to-analog converter in the delta sigma modulator (fig. 4, 86).

Claim 16, inherits the limitations of Claim 14. Further the limitation of a memory that stores data for the plurality of frequency patterns, the memory providing the selected one of the plurality of frequency patterns in response to the selection input is met by Hori et al. as described in Claim 2 above.

Claim 17, inherits the limitations of Claim 14, further the limitation of a delta-sigma modulator coupled to process the selected one of the plurality of frequency patterns and to provide the delta-sigma modulated signal to the digital-to-analog converter is met by Hori et al. as described in Claim 6 above.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25, 26 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin M. File whose telephone number is (571)272-6040. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Application/Control Number: 10/608,926 Page 6

Art Unit: 2634

supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on (571)272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erin M. File

EF

7/21/2005

STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600